IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SHERMAN DIVISION

STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.	§	
Plaintiff,	§	Civil Action No. 4:03-CV-276
	§	
VS.	§	Judge Leonard E. Davis
	§	
MOTOROLA, INC., and	§	
FREESCALE, INC.	§	Jury Trial Demanded
Defendants,	§	
Counterclaim Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
VS.	§	
	§	
STMICROELECTRONICS, N.V., and	§	
STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.,	§	•
Counterclaim Defendants.	§	

THE ST PARTIES' MOTION TO EXTEND PAGE LIMITS

- 1. STMicroelectronics, N.V., and STMicroelectronics, Inc.(collectively "the ST Parties") move the Court to extend the page limit for their Sur-Reply in Opposition to Motorola's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on the Diaz Patent for Its Set-Top Box Products.
- 2. Motorola, Inc. ("Motorola") has filed a Motion for Summary Judgment of Patent Exhaustion of the Diaz Patent With Respect to Motorola's Set-Top Box Products (the "Patent Exhaustion Motion"). The ST Parties then filed an Opposition to the Patent Exhaustion Motion which included the Declaration of Omid E. Kia, Ph.D. ("Kia Declaration").
- 3. On September 24, 2004, Motorola filed an Unopposed Motion for Leave to Exceed Page Limits With Respect to Replies to Motorola's Exhaustion Motion. In its motion to exceed page limits, Motorola stated that it "agrees that STM may exceed the limits set forth in L.R. CV-7(a)(1) by five pages for STM's sur-reply to the Exhaustion Motion." Accordingly,

Motorola agreed not to oppose the ST Parties' right to file a sur-reply that does not exceed fifteen (15) pages, including attachments.

- 4. Motorola has now filed a Reply in Support of the Patent Exhaustion Motion. In its Reply (as well as Motorola's separate motion to strike most of the Kia Declaration), Motorola has complained that the materials reviewed by Dr. Kia as he formed his expert opinion were not submitted for the Court's consideration. Although all of these materials were originally produced by Motorola, the ST Parties are now forced to submit a Supplemental Declaration of Omid E. Kia, Ph.D. ("Supplemental Kia Declaration") that includes the many Motorola-produced documents reviewed by Dr. Kia for his original Kia Declaration.
- 5. The ST Parties' sur-reply brief and the Supplemental Kia Declaration do not exceed fifteen (15) pages. However, Motorola has left the ST Parties with no option but to attach "the technical documentation that Motorola has produced for the Broadcom BCM 7XXX devices." While the ST Parties do not wish to burden the Court with these voluminous documents, Motorola has forced the ST Parties to do so.

For these reasons, the ST Parties move for leave to file a sur-reply that includes attachments in excess of the standard page limit.

Dated: October 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce S. Sostek by pornue green Texas Bar No. 18855700
Attorney-in-Charge
Jane Politz Brandt
Texas Bar No. 02882090
Max Ciccarelli
Texas Bar No. 00787242
THOMPSON & KNIGHT LLP
1700 Pacific Avenue, Suite 3300
Dallas, Texas 75201B4693
214.969.1700
214.969.1751 (facsimile)

Michael E. Jones
Texas Bar No. 10929400
Cindy Allen
Texas Bar No. 00784619
POTTER MINTON
A Professional Corporation
110 North College
500 Plaza Tower
Tyler, Texas 75702
903.597.8311
903.593.0846 (facsimile)

Clyde Siebman
Texas Bar No. 18341600
SIEBMAN, REYNOLDS & BURG, LLP
421 North Crockett
Sherman, Texas 75090
903.870.0070
903.870.0066 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.

James P. Bradley, Esq.)
Texas Bar No. 02826000
Attorney-in-Charge
Charles S. Cotropia
Texas Bar No. 04858600
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 North Harwood Street, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
214.981.3300
214.981.3400 (facsimile)

Michael E. Jones
Texas Bar No. 10929400
Cindy Allen
Texas Bar No. 00784619
POTTER MINTON
A Professional Corporation
110 North College
500 Plaza Tower
Tyler, Texas 75702
903.597.8311
903.593.0846 (facsimile)

Clyde Siebman
Texas Bar No. 18341600
SIEBMAN, REYNOLDS & BURG, LLP
421 North Crockett
Sherman, Texas 75090
903.870.0070
903.870.0066 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT STMICROELECTRONICS, N.V.

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

On October 4, 2004, counsel for STMicroelectronics, N.V., transmitted an email to counsel for Motorola, Inc. (Hilda Galvan and David Witcoff) inquiring whether Motorola opposes the ST Parties' Motion to Extend Page Limits. The email advised that the ST Parties would consider the motion opposed if counsel for Motorola did not respond by 4 pm on October 4th. Since no response was received from counsel for Motorola, it is presumed that Motorola opposes this motion.

Kelly J. Kubasta

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On the day of October, 2004, a true and correct copy of this brief was served on the following counsel of record via Federal Express:

Kenneth R. Adamo, Esq. Hilda C. Galvan, Esq. JONES DAY 2727 North Harwood Street Dallas, Texas 75201 Carl R. Roth, Esq. THE ROTH LAW FIRM 115 N. Wellington, Suite 200 Marshall, Texas 75670

Jama O. Brully